DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 474 782 PS 031 172

AUTHOR	Campbell, Dottie C.
TITLE	Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care. Collaboration among Child Care, Head Start, and Pre-Kindergarten: A Telephone Survey of Selected Southern States.
INSTITUTION	Southern Inst. on Children and Families, Columbia, SC.
SPONS AGENCY	David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Los Altos, CA.
PUB DATE	2002-12-00
NOTE	33p.; For related document, see ED 463 835.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Institute on Children and Families, 500 Taylor Street, Suite 202, Columbia, SC 29201. Tel: 803-779-2607; Fax: 803-254-6301; e-mail: info@kidsouth.org; Web site: http://www.kidsouth.org; Web site: http://www.coveringkids.org. For full text: http://www.kidsouth.org/ pdf/DC_Report_Final.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Cooperation; *Child Care; Children; Early Childhood Education; Followup Studies; Partnerships in Education; Preschool Education; *Public Policy; *State Surveys; *Telephone Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Project Head Start; United States (South)

ABSTRACT

This study examined the type of collaboration occurring among child care, Head Start, and prekindergarten programs in eight southern states.The telephone survey was follow-up to a written survey of child care administrators in 15 southern states and the District of Columbia. Participating in the telephone survey were seven child care administrators and eight Head Start state collaboration directors from eight states. Participants had an opportunity to review questions prior to their interview and were allowed to submit responses in writing. Traditional areas of collaboration were identified, including professional development, extension of Head Start and prekindergarten for working parents, state planning committees to improve school readiness indicators, and development of parent education materials. Emerging areas of collaboration were also identified, including universal prekindergarten, early literacy, mental health, and comprehensive family support services. Each survey participant described up to three collaborative projects. Respondents generally agreed that policies were not a barrier to collaboration, but a few state child care policies were cited as burdensome by Head Start providers because they required that programs operate differently. Federal and state policies restricting funding to 4-year-olds were cited as problematic. Federal health policies restricting how states could use funds were also cited as a problem. Five states reported problems at some point with early childhood practice issues based in different program cultures or philosophies as obstacles to collaboration. States generally reported being open to technical assistance. Survey participants identified lessons learned from their collaborative projects, and their advice for federal officials was solicited. (Two appendices contain a list of the individuals interviewed for this report and the telephone survey instrument used.) (KB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 474 782

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care

Collaboration Among Child Care, Head Start, and Pre-Kindergarten

A Telephone Survey of Selected Southern States

Prepared for

The Southern Institute on Children and Families
Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care
500 Taylor Street, Suite 202
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 779-2607
www.kidsouth.org

By

Dottie C. Campbell

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Kristine Hartvigsen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

December 2002

PS 031172

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The views expressed in this survey are those of the author and no official endorsement by the Southern Institute on Children and Families or The David and Lucile Packard Foundation is intended or should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....1

AREAS OF COLLABORATION.....1

Traditional Areas of Collaboration.....2

Emerging Areas of Collaboration.....2

Collaboration Project Areas Described by Survey Respondents.....3

IMPETUS FOR COLLABORATION.....5

POLICY ISSUES.....6

EARLY CHILDHOOD PRACTICE ISSUES.....8

DIFFERENCES IN PROGRAM CULTURE OF PHILOSOPHY.....9

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE USED BY STATES.....11

LESSONS LEARNED.....12

ADVICE FOR FEDERAL OFFICIALS.....12

NOTABLE QUOTES FROM THE STATES.....13

What Does It Take To Collaborate.....3
Take Advantage Of Opportunities.....14

Conclusions From The Field.....14

APPENDIX

A. State Contacts Who Responded to Requests for an Interview.....15

B. Collaboration Between State Child Care Programs and Federal Head Start.....

Southern Regional Initiative on Child Care

Collaboration Among Child Care, Head Start, and Pre-Kindergarten

A Telephone Survey of Selected Southern States

Introduction

Child care administrators in 15 states and the District of Columbia responded to a written survey on quality child care conducted by the Southern Institute on Children and Families.[1] All 16 state child care administrators responded that they were collaborating with Head Start. Twelve responded that they were collaborating with pre-kindergarten. A follow-up telephone survey on collaboration was conducted in eight states. The telephone survey included states who had rated their collaboration efforts both as very effective as well as ineffective. While the survey specifically asked about collaboration between Head Start and child care, responses usually included pre-kindergarten as well.

Seven child care administrators and eight Head Start state collaboration directors from eight states participated in this telephone survey about collaboration in early childhood. Appendix A provides the list of those surveyed. Appendix B provides the questions asked during the interview. Participants were given a chance to review the questions prior to the interview and were allowed to submit responses in writing. A written report of the telephone interview was prepared, and each participant was given an opportunity to correct the report. Participants in the survey were promised that individual survey reports would not be published and that state identifying information about problems would not be provided. These

[1] Southern Institute on Children and Families, December 2001, State Survey on Quality Child Care.

promises were made to elicit frank and honest discussions about obstacles to collaboration. This report provides information gathered from the interviews.

Areas of Collaboration

Collaboration between child care and Head Start has been encouraged for more than ten years by the US Department of Health and Human Services. The Head Start Collaboration grants are demonstrative of this priority. Another occasion for federal encouragement of collaboration between child care and Head Start occurred when the Child Care and Development Block Grant legislation was passed. Over the years, states have responded to this federal priority and their own need to maximize funds with collaborative projects. Following is a description of some of the traditional areas of collaboration and the emerging areas of collaboration.

Traditional Areas of Collaboration

- **Professional development.** States have for some time included child care and Head Start in joint training events. The current trend is to enhance this effort by establishing an early childhood professional development system for teachers in Head Start, child care and pre-kindergarten, including teacher certification. The system usually involves community colleges and higher education, providing associate degrees with coursework that can transfer to 4- and 5-year degrees. Development of the system may include common core competencies, state certificates, and articulation agreements.

- **Extending Head Start and pre-kindergarten for working parents.** States often work collaboratively to minimize the number of children required to move from one provider to another during the day. The necessity for this movement during the day arises when working parents need more hours of care for their children during the day or need care for the summer months. In these instances, child care funds are used to pay for extending the day and the year in Head Start and pre-kindergarten programs.

- **State planning committees formed to improve family and child indicators related to school readiness.** These state strategic planning efforts include not only Head Start, child care, and pre-kindergarten, but also health and mental health.

- **Written materials developed to improve parents' knowledge of child development and parenting practices that stimulate**

development. Funding and professional expertise usually comes from Head Start, child care, pre-kindergarten, health and mental health.

- **Smooth transitions for families and children that move from one early childhood setting to another.** Parents and children who move from child care to Head Start or from child care and Head Start to public schools receive assistance from these care providers in preparing for the differences in the care settings.

Emerging Areas of Collaboration

- **Universal pre-kindergarten.** Universal pre-kindergarten state legislation, providing for some degree of early care for children 4 years of age as a precursor to kindergarten, is serving as a galvanizing event for collaboration, even in states without prior successes. In addition to schools, child care and Head Start are part of the delivery system for universal pre-k. This allows states to maximize funding from all sources, as well as access classroom facilities and manpower resources critical to meeting a statewide need. Often Head Start performance standards are adopted as policy for universal pre-k, thereby establishing a curriculum framework common to all preschool providers.

- **Early literacy**. Early literacy, a priority of the Bush administration and included in the No Child Left Behind initiative, is a new challenge for states. Many states have yet to develop their plans for addressing the requirements of this federal initiative, but some states are already working on their own efforts to comply. Some of the states interviewed have worked collaboratively to adopt a common curriculum or core competencies for pre-k, child care, and Head Start. This new federal initiative provides an excellent opportunity for collaboration.

- **Mental health.** Mental health resources for very young children and their families and for caregivers of very young children are becoming a priority for states. It is generally not recognized that young children can have mental health problems that cause behavioral problems too severe to address with normal parenting skills and traditional early childhood teaching methods. Mental health systems in many states do not have the necessary financial or professional resources to work with young children, their families, and their caregivers. Head Start, child care, and pre-k are working collaboratively to address these inadequacies in states' mental health systems.

- **Comprehensive family support services.** Comprehensive family support services (including health, parent involvement, home-visiting) offered by Head Start are being extended to families in child care and pre-k settings. While this is not a new funding source, it is becoming a new priority for states. It is usually a collaborative effort either between pre-k and Head Start or between child care and Head Start. Either pre-k or child care provides the teacher and teacher aide while Head Start provides the comprehensive services. Public school, child care or Head Start classrooms are used as the settings. Occasionally a project will wrap Head Start comprehensive family support services around families in family child care.

Collaboration Project Areas Described by Survey Respondents

Survey participants were asked to provide a brief description of up to three collaborative projects. Table 1 provides a listing of the collaborative projects described in this survey and the states implementing the projects. Since states were asked to provide up to three projects, some states may have other collaborative projects that were not described during the interview and therefore are not a part of this table. Therefore, the list should not be taken as inclusive of all collaborative projects in the surveyed states. The table is organized by the following categories: traditional collaborative projects, emerging collaborative projects, and others.

Table 1 Areas of Collaboration	
Traditional Areas of Collaboration	**States Providing Descriptions of Projects in Area**
Professional development, which can range in complexity from joint training events to a professional development system that provides graduating levels of certificates and degrees for early childhood professionals.	Arkansas District of Columbia North Carolina South Carolina Tennessee
Child care expenditures for families in Head Start and pre-kindergarten settings to extend the hours during the day and add care for the summer months to accommodate the needs of working parents.	Georgia South Carolina West Virginia
State planning committees formed to improve family and child indicators related to school readiness.	District of Columbia Kentucky
Written materials developed to improve parents' knowledge of child development and those parenting practices that stimulate development.	Tennessee
Smooth transitions for families and children that move from one early childhood setting to another.	District of Columbia Kentucky
Emerging Areas of Collaboration	**States Providing Descriptions of Projects in Area**
Universal pre-kindergarten state legislation, providing for some degree of early care for children 4 years of age as a precursor to kindergarten.	Georgia North Carolina West Virginia
Early literacy, a priority of the Bush administration and included in the federal No Child Left Behind initiative.	Arkansas District of Columbia Tennessee
Mental health resources for very young children and their families and for caregivers of very young children.	Arkansas Kentucky
Extended comprehensive family support services (including health, parent involvement, home-visiting) offered by Head Start to families in child care and pre-k settings	District of Columbia West Virginia

Other Collaborative Projects	States Providing Descriptions of Projects in Area
Funding additional slots in Early Head Start.	Georgia
Providing a professional for Head Start teachers and aides to assist with inclusion strategies for special needs children.	Georgia
Enhancing services for TANF families in Head Start programs to assist them in getting jobs.	District of Columbia
Connecting families with child support and associated training to increase the number of families receiving child support payments.	North Carolina
Expanding family literacy resources through the faith community.	North Carolina
Expanding resources for parents of children with asthma.	South Carolina
Allowing Head Start to determine eligibility for child care.	South Carolina
When additional funds made child care vouchers available between enrollment periods, Head Start grantees allocated vouchers to those families they determined to be in need in their service areas.	South Carolina
Transitioning child care funding for Head Start grantees from vouchers to contracts.	Tennessee
Establishing a 3-tiered licensing system and using ECERS and ITERS to rate facilities.	Tennessee

Impetus for Collaboration

Individuals interviewed were asked not only to describe collaborative projects, but also the impetus behind the project. Responses are categorized below:

- State priority to improve readiness rates
- State desire to maximize funds
- Federal priority on collaboration between Head Start and child care
- State desire to respond to gaps in the system
- Early care and education system need to respond to a federal or state priority or mandate
- Grant opportunity that required collaboration

Policy Issues

In describing collaborative projects, survey participants were asked to identify policies that were problematic. Respondents generally agreed that policies were not a barrier to collaboration, but a few state child care policies were cited as burdensome to Head Start providers because they required that programs operate differently. Problematic state child care policies that were cited:

- **Absentee policies.** Head Start funding is not determined by attendance. In fact, this federal program requires that when a child has several absences, the program follow-up to determine if there is a family problem that needs to be addressed. States have the authority to establish absentee policies for child care funding and usually place some restrictions on paying for absences. Those states with more restrictive policies present more problems for Head Start. Examples: One state pays for absences if the program has an overall 90% attendance rate. This state said that the child care absentee policy was not a problem for Head Start. Another state does not pay for any absences. This state reported that the child care absentee policy presents a problem for Head Start providers.

- **Restricted child care eligibility enrollment and renewal time frames.** Because child care funds are so limited, they do not meet the need for all eligible parents. Thus, the state establishes an enrollment period when funds are allocated. Enrollment and eligibility renewals are not scheduled at times consistent with Head Start enrollment periods. Child care pays for extending the day and year for families enrolled in Head Start programs. If Head Start accepts a new family

during the year, child care funding is not available to extend the day and year for this family.

- **Co-pay for families.** Most states require that parents who are recipients of child care funds pay a fee to offset a portion of the cost of child care. Head Start has a long tradition of providing free services to families. Many Head Start programs are not set up to collect fees and do not want to do so.

- **Vouchers rather than contracts.** Head Start is a federal program funded by federal grants which provide reliable funding. These programs are not used to operating with funding dependent on parent vouchers that may or may not be available for the program year.

- **Children lose eligibility when a parent loses his job.** A state child care policy states that parents who lose their job have 30 days to secure another or they lose their eligibility. Head Start eligibility lasts for the whole year regardless of whether the parents are working or not. The disruption in funding due to lost eligibility as well as the philosophical difference of providing care to children regardless of the parents' employment status poses a problem for Head Start programs.

Federal and state policies that restrict funding to children 4 years of age were cited as problematic. Traditional Head Start pays for children 3 and 4 years of age. More private child care providers offer services to children 3 and 4 years of age than to younger children. It has been reported by private child care providers that they make their profit on after-school care and on children 3 and 4 years of age because the cost of care for infants and toddlers is more than parents can afford. Pre-kindergarten state funding for schools typically only supports care for children 4 years of age. Since all providers serve children 4 years of age, in certain geographic areas the market place for these children is saturated, while parents are unable to find subsidized care for children birth to three. The survey respondents who talked about this issue stated that it is frustrating to early childhood providers that they cannot use public funding to serve younger children.

Federal health policies that were very restrictive on how states could use funds were cited as a problem. Head Start cost allocation policies were mentioned as being difficult and complicated. And different reporting requirements of federal and state funding agencies were also cited as a problem.

It should be noted that most individuals interviewed were more focused on successes rather than obstacles. The general consensus is that if Head Start, child care, and pre-kindergarten state leaders want to collaborate, they can find solutions for policy obstacles.

Each of the policies cited above were mentioned by only a few states. Table 2 demonstrates the extent to which policy problems were cited. Note that respondents were asked to talk about obstacles to collaboration as related to the projects they chose to describe in this telephone survey. Therefore, the list should not be taken as inclusive of all policy obstacles that states have had to overcome.

Table 2
Policies That Were Cited As Obstacles to Collaboration

Policies	State Policy	Federal Policy	Number of States Citing Policy
Funding through vouchers rather than contracts.	X		3
Federal and state funds restricted to 4-year olds.		X	2
Restrictive federal funding policies for health services.		X	2
Absentee policies.	X		2
Federal cost allocation policies.		X	1

Different reporting requirements.	X	X	1
Restricted child care eligibility enrollment periods and child care renewal time-frames.	X		1
Co-pay for families.	X		1
Children lose eligibility when parent loses job.	X		1

Early Childhood Practice Issues

Early childhood practice issues were identified by three states as obstacles to collaboration. Two other states said that they had overcome these obstacles when they developed core standards common to all programs. Therefore, of the eight states interviewed, five reported problems at some point with early childhood practice issues. Of the three states who did not cite problems with practice issues, two did not describe collaborative projects which dealt with early childhood practice issues. Table 3 lists the practice issues that survey participants cited as problematic.

Table 3 **Early Childhood Practice Issues Cited As Obstacles to Collaboration**
Developmentally appropriate practices that can be characterized by: • Teacher-directed versus child-initiated teaching methods; • Traditional classroom with desks and printed materials versus learning centers that are activity oriented; • Disciplined versus relaxed environment for child's exploratory behavior.
Classroom management that can be characterized by: • Standing in line without talking versus organized but individualized or active movement from one setting to another;

• Sitting at desks versus moving from one learning center to another; • Fixed daily schedules versus flexible schedules.
Comprehensive family support services that are a critical supportive component in education.

Early childhood practice issues arise due to different approaches to educating and caring for young children. Sometimes these practice issues prevented collaborative projects from succeeding and other times proved to be serious obstacles for states to overcome. If practice issues were neglected by state leaders during the planning stage, they arose when initiatives were implemented. Since practice issues are of most concern to teachers, it was only when teachers were involved in achieving consensus that collaborative projects could be implemented successfully.

Differences in Program Culture or Philosophy

Practice differences can be related back to the origins of these programs which establish their different program cultures and philosophies.

- Head Start is a federally funded and administered program. Head Start has a long history of comprehensive services as well as a history of child-initiated, developmentally appropriate practice.
- Pre-kindergarten is governed by public schools and primarily supported and administered by the state. Pre-kindergarten classes sometimes take on more of the aspects of a school environment and a typical first grade education approach, albeit for younger children.
- Child Care, with federal and state funds, is administered by the state. State child care programs focus on supporting the child care needs of working parents as well as improving the quality of child care. Some private child care providers approach the care of preschool children more like schools and others more like Head Start. However, child care practice is generally governed more by funding level than by a historical program philosophy.

Certainly there are some schools that are leaders in their communities on appropriate developmental practice for educating young children just as there are Head Start programs that are not as effective as they should be in implementing the Head Start performance standards. However, survey respondents noted the differences described above when they discussed overcoming problems related back to these different philosophical approaches to early care and education.

For each project described during the telephone survey, participants were asked if differences in program culture or philosophy presented problems. The few responses to this question can be organized into two categories: differences among early childhood programs and differences between early childhood and other professions. Table 4 uses this organization to present responses. Each response was received from only one state. It should be noted that responses that duplicated those listed above under practice issues are not repeated in Table 4.

Table 4
Program Culture and Philosophical Differences Cited by Survey Respondents

Program Culture or Philosophical Differences Among Early Childhood Programs
Head Start and pre-kindergarten traditionally follow a public school schedule, part-day and 9 months, while child care wants service that is full-day and full-year to meet the needs of working parents. The survey respondent stated that Head Start and pre-kindergarten personnel often do not want to change to a more expanded schedule.
Head Start operates under a family support philosophy that focuses services not only on the child but also the child's family. Child care and pre-kindergarten have not traditionally offered these comprehensive services and do not feel they have the financial resources to enhance services in this manner.
Child care is a block grant and provides the state more flexibility in setting policy, while Head Start is a federal grant governed by federal policies.
Child care has a specific identity and Head Start has a different identity. Neither wants to lose their unique identity.

Program Culture and Philosophical

17

Differences Between Early Childhood and Other Professions
Mental health has very different terminology from early childhood, and collaboration requires that each party understand the terminology of the other.
Bridging the gaps among academia, state bureaucracy and service delivery can be quite a challenge.

Technical Assistance Used by States

States generally reported being open to technical assistance. Participants were asked specifically if they have used QUILT as a technical assistance provider. All other technical assistance providers cited during the interview are associated with the projects the participants chose to describe. Thus technical assistance providers used on projects not discussed in the interview are not reported.

Table 5
Technical Assistance Used by States

Technical Assistance Providers	Number of States Citing Provider
Administration for Children and Families (ACF) Central and Regional Office	5
QUILT	4
National Child Care Information Center	3
Another State	3
Higher Education	3
National Head Start Association	2
Professional Experts	2
ACF Regional Office Head Start Training and Technical Assistance provider	1

Lessons Learned

After describing a collaborative project, each person interviewed was asked to share the "lessons learned" from that project. Noteworthy responses are provided below:

> All stakeholders should be present in the beginning. Buy-in by stakeholders is critical.
> There is no project boiler plate that fits everyone. Each project must be designed by those who will implement it.
> Don't short-cut the process. Discuss different philosophies and beliefs and identify and get consensus on policies and practices in the planning and design phases. Each must be open and honest about his beliefs.
> Technical assistance is more effective on the front-end, in the planning and design phases. If you fail to identify problem areas and reach consensus during the planning and design phases, you cannot expect that technical assistance will be able to overcome that negligence in the implementation phase.
> Practice issues must be discussed at the teacher level to resolve differences.
> Timing is everything. It helps if you have established successes in collaboration on easier issues, before you tackle a really difficult issue. Prior successes tend to make the next project a little easier. Timing is also important in seizing opportunities. When an issue is a priority in the state, draw all partners together to discuss how to address the issue. The urgency of the issue will help collaboration.
> It helps to have a thick skin when you listen to others in the group and to put yourself in their position. Challenge all your own reasons for "doing it your way."
> Be sure the project is not dependent on a champion. Institutionalize components as they are developed.
> Collaborative partners are a much stronger political voice.

Advice for Federal Officials

Survey participants were asked if they had any advice for other state child care administrators, Head Start state collaboration directors or for federal officials. Advice to state child care and Head Start officials is shared in another section of this report, Notable Quotes from the States. Advice to federal officials generally was to collaborate in the same way that they are

asking states to collaborate and to loosen restrictions on funding. Below are a few quotes that represent these sentiments.

> US Department of Education, Head Start, Child Care, Maternal and Child Health and Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services need to do what they are asking states to do:
>
> - Talk together;
> - Vision together;
> - Develop plans together;
> - Set policies together.
>
> Federal officials need to walk the walk not just talk the talk. The following programs at the federal level should get together on the issue of early childhood and family support, collaboratively examine policies, reduce inconsistencies, and create flexibility: Head Start and Child Care Bureaus, Child and Adult Care Food Program, and the Department of Education, Early Childhood and Adult Learning. Health and Mental Health need to join this process, along with senior grandparents program in the Office on Aging, Developmental Disabilities, Paternity and Child Support, Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Labor.
>
> Give more flexibility on funding restrictions/regulations. Judge states on getting the job done rather than specifying how money can be spent. Allow the states to get the same job done but in a different manner. Head Start and Child Care are better at providing flexibility than other areas of the US Department of Health and Human Services are not.
>
> There is a need for closer alignment between early childhood programs and Medicaid. Where federal agreements across programs (Child Care, Head Start, Medicaid, Maternal and Child Health, etc.) are in place, this needs to be made known to states. Technical assistance should be provided to states to help them take advantage of these federal intra- and inter-departmental agreements.

Notable Quotes from the States

Interviews, naturally, deviated from the original questionnaire. The conversations were often more directed by survey participants than by the questions. Listening to what state leaders wanted to talk about resulted in some valuable insight that is organized and shared below.

What Does It Take to Collaborate?

- Collaboration is more likely to succeed if each party needs the other to meet an objective. For example, universal pre-k requires more of schools than they can do and threatens Head Start and private child care providers' ability to serve children who are 4 years of age. Each provider group is then motivated to collaborate in order to meet its needs.
- The collaborative group needs to have authority and needs to be backed by a strong authority, such as the Governor's Office.
- Policies should make it easy to collaborate at both the state and local levels. When establishing policies or reviewing existing policies, ask the question, "Does this promote collaboration?"

Take Advantage of Opportunities

Any new funding from the federal or state level, such as universal pre-k.
A new priority or mandate established at the federal or state level.

- By 2003, 50% of Head Start teachers must have an associate degree in early childhood.
- Early literacy – No Child Left Behind – is a Bush administration priority.
- Stresses on the current system. For example more money restricted to 4 year olds than other ages usually causes frustration and concerns among provider groups.

Conclusions from the Field

- You will find that all parties want good outcomes for children and support services for their families. If you identify this early on, working together is not as hard to do. Focus on similarities not on differences.
- Collaboration difficulties are a result of personalities more than standards or differences of opinion.
- If you need one another, you wi.l be more likely to find a way to collaborate. Look for the significant needs of each member of the partnership and find out how the group can meet those needs.
- It takes time, but if there is a willingness to stay at it and to form true partnerships, you can make it happen.

Appendix A

State Contacts Who Responded to Requests for an Interview

Arkansas

Child Care: Janie Huddleston
Department of Human Services
janie.huddleston@mail.state.ar.us
501-682-4895 (p)
501-682-2317 (f)

Head Start: Ann Patterson
Arkansas Head Start Association
ann@arheadstart.org
501-371-0740 (p)
501-370-9109 (f)

District of Columbia

Child Care: Barbara Kamara
Department of Human Services
bkamara@dhs.dcgov.org
202-727-5220 (p)
202-727-8166 (f)

Head Start: Beverly Roberson Jackson
District of Columbia Head Start State Collaboration Office
beverly.jackson@dcgov.org
202-727-8113 (p)
202-727-8164 (f)

Georgia

Child Care: Gail Ormsby
Department of Human Resources
gaormsby@dhr.state.ga.us
404-657-3441 (p)
404-657-3439 (f)

Head Start: Dr. Robert Lawrence
Office of School Readiness
robert.lawrence@mail.osr.state.ga.us
404-656-5957 (p)
404-651-7184 (f)

Kentucky

Head Start: Christine Killen
Governor's Office of Early Childhood Development
christinef.killen@mail.state.ky.us
502-564-8099 (p)
502-564-8330 (f)

North Carolina

Child Care: Peggy Ball
Division of Child Development
peggy.ball@ncmail.net
919-662-4543 (p)
919-662-4568 (f)

Head Start: Ronald Moore
Division of Child Development
ronald.moore@ncmail.net
919-662-4543 (p)
919-662-4568 (f)

South Carolina

Child Care: Kitty Casoli
Department of Health and Human Services
casoli@dhhs.state.sc.us
803-898-2570 (p)
803-898-4510 (f)

Head Start: Mary Lynn Diggs
Department of Health and Human Services
diggs@dhhs.state.sc.us
803-898-2550 (p)
803-898-4458 (f)

Tennessee

Child Care: Deborah Neill
Department of Human Services
dneill@mail.state.tn.us
615-313-4770 (p)
615-532-9956 (f)

Head Start: Janet Coscarelli
Department of Education
janet.coscarelli@state.tn.us
615-741-4849 (p)
615-532-4989 (f)

West Virginia

Child Care: Kay Tilton
Department of Health and Human Resources
ktilton@wvdhhr.org
304-558-2993 (p)
304-558-8800 (f)

Head Start: William Huebner
Governor's Cabinet on Children and Families
bhuebner@wvnvm.wvnet.edu
304-558-4638 (p)
304-558-0596 (f)

Appendix B

Collaboration Between State Child Care Programs And Federal Head Start Programs

A Survey of 8 Southern States

The purpose of the survey is to gather descriptive information on:

Projects demonstrating collaboration between Head Start and Child Care
The impetus behind collaboration
The difficulties in collaboration
Strategies employed for addressing difficulties
Lessons learned
Resources/strategies/models for other states
Suggestions for state/federal government

For purposes of this survey, collaboration is defined as any type of initiative that brings together pieces of the Head Start and Child Care systems.

The survey will be conducted through telephone interviews with state child care administrators and Head Start state collaboration directors, using the following questions to guide the conversation.

1. State Child Care Administrators: Who is the administering agency and what are the funding sources supporting the state child care program?

   Head Start Collaboration Directors: Who are the grantees in the state? ____ Community Action Agencies; ____ Public Schools; ____ Public Child Care programs; ____ Private Child Care programs; ____ Nonprofit Agencies

2. Describe up to 3 collaboration project(s). If possible, choose projects that fall in 3 of the following 4 categories: one that was tried and failed; one that was tried and not continued for reasons other than failure; one that was successful; one that is now underway.

Project #1

Brief Description of Collaboration Project:

What is the goal/purpose?

What was the impetus behind this project? (Encouragement from federal agencies; need to maximize resources; politically important in the state; desire on the part of one or more individuals, etc.)

What stage of the project are you in:

___ Just started
___ Several years but still making changes
___ Final stage and will continue
___ Final stage and will not continue
___ Prior project not now underway

If project has not or will not continue, why?

What parts of the project do you consider successful?

What parts of the project do you consider failures?

With what parts of the project are you still struggling?

What were the difficulties that you face(d)?

- Policy: federal, state or local; funding source for policy

- Practice: state or local interpretation of policy; administering agency for practice.

- Program culture/philosophy: bias against other program; lack of knowledge of other program (misconceptions); distrust of other program; other program culture/philosophy issues.

- Other.

How did you address these difficulties? Were you successful?

Did you receive technical assistance? From whom?

If you did not receive technical assistance, do you think individuals from the following could have been helpful in addressing the difficulties you described?

___ Federal technical assistance provider;
___ Federal agencies;
___ Another state with a similar project or successful strategy;
___ Any other source?

Were any policy changes adopted as a result of this project? Describe.

Have you done an evaluation of the project?

- Formal or informal. Describe.

- Results.

Have there been any "lessons learned" as a result of this project that you would pass along to others?

Project #2

Brief Description of Collaboration Project:

What is the goal/purpose?

What was the impetus behind this project? (Encouragement from federal agencies; need to maximize resources; politically important in the state; desire on the part of one or more individuals, etc.)

What stage of the project are you in:

___ Just started
___ Several years but still making changes
___ Final stage and will continue
___ Final stage and will not continue
___ Prior project not now underway

If project has not or will not continue, why?

What parts of the project do you consider successful?

What parts of the project do you consider failures?

With what parts of the project are you still struggling?

What were the difficulties that you face(d)?

- Policy: federal, state or local; funding source for policy

- Practice: state or local interpretation of policy; administering agency for practice.

- Program culture/philosophy: bias against other program; lack of knowledge of other program (misconceptions); distrust of other program; other program culture/philosophy issues.

- Other.

How did you address these difficulties? Were you successful?

Did you receive technical assistance? From whom?

If you did not receive technical assistance, do you think individuals from the following could have been helpful in addressing the difficulties you described?

___ Federal technical assistance provider;
___ Federal agencies;
___ Another state with a similar project or successful strategy;
___ Any other source?

Were any policy changes adopted as a result of this project? Describe.

Have you done an evaluation of the project?

- Formal or informal. Describe.

- Results.

Have there been any "lessons learned" as a result of this project that you would pass along to others?

Project #3

Brief Description of Collaboration Project:

What is the goal/purpose?

What was the impetus behind this project? (Encouragement from federal agencies; need to maximize resources; politically important in the state; desire on the part of one or more individuals, etc.)

What stage of the project are you in:

___ Just started
___ Several years but still making changes
___ Final stage and will continue
___ Final stage and will not continue
___ Prior project not now underway

If project has not or will not continue, why?

What parts of the project do you consider successful?

What parts of the project do you consider failures?

With what parts of the project are you still struggling?

What were the difficulties that you face(d)?

- Policy: federal, state or local; funding source for policy

- Practice: state or local interpretation of policy; administering agency for practice.

- Program culture/philosophy: bias against other program; lack of knowledge of other program (misconceptions); distrust of other program; other program culture/philosophy issues.

- Other.

How did you address these difficulties? Were you successful?

Did you receive technical assistance? From whom?

If you did not receive technical assistance, do you think individuals from the following could have been helpful in addressing the difficulties you described?

___ Federal technical assistance provider;

___ Federal agencies;
___ Another state with a similar project or successful strategy;
___ Any other source?

Were any policy changes adopted as a result of this project? Describe.

Have you done an evaluation of the project?

- Formal or informal. Describe.

- Results.

Have there been any "lessons learned" as a result of this project that you would pass along to others?

3. Differences in absentee policies have been identified by some states as a policy barrier to collaboration between Head Start and Child Care. Has this been a problem for you? If so, describe the differences in policies in your state. How have you addressed this issue?

4. Would you be interested in receiving the following types of technical assistance in the following areas?

___ Identifying areas for collaboration
    ___ Federal technical assistance provider
    ___ Another state that has been successful

___ Designing a collaboration project
    ___ Federal technical assistance provider
    ___ Another state that has been successful

___ Implementation strategies
    ___ Federal technical assistance provider
    ___ Another state that has been successful

___ Maintaining projects over time
    ___ Federal technical assistance provider
    ___ Another state that has been successful

5. Have you used the QUILT project? How was it helpful?

6. What is your overall impression of the success of collaboration with Head Start/Child Care in your State?

7. How has collaboration helped:

   Toward meeting your program mission/goals.

   The families and children your program serves.

8. What suggestions/recommendations would you like to make to:

   Other State Child Care/Head Start administrators.

   To federal policy makers.

   To others.

9. Do you think there are things you could share with other states to help them collaborate with Head Start/Child Care?

   ___ Resources that have been used and how

   ___ Strategies that have worked

   ___ Models that have been successful

   ___ Effective practices that help bridge the culture gap between programs

   ___ Effective evaluation efforts

   ___ Other:

10. Is your program (Head Start/Child Care) collaborating with the State Pre-K program in a project that doesn't include (Child Care/Head Start)?

    (a) Describe

    (b) Why is Child Care/Head Start not involved?

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (1/2003)

PS 031172